

Remarks

The Examiner has required restriction under 35 USC 121 and 372 and election of one of the following inventions: group I of claims 8 through 25 drawn to a floor table; group II of claims 26 through 34 and 36 through 38 drawn to a displacing device and method for use thereof; and group III of claim 35 drawn to a method of displacing a floor table. The Examiner states that the inventions of groups I through III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT rule 13.1, since they lack the same or corresponding special technical features. In particular, the Examiner states that the table as claimed in group I is disclosed by Colnot '280 and therefore does not contribute over prior art. Groups II and III do not contain any special technical features recited in group I.

In response to this restriction/election requirement, the Applicant hereby elects the invention of group III of claim 35 drawn to a method of displacing a floor table. This election is **with traverse**.

The traverse is based on the amendment to the subject claims which recast the claimed structures in such a fashion as to constitute a common single general inventive concept. In particular, elected claim 35 has been recast in independent form, thereby maintaining the special technical features of that claim prior to amendment. New independent claim 39 is directed to a device for displacing a floor table and recites the identical special technical features of method claim 35 using means for function language. Claims 35 and 39 therefore represent a common inventive concept. Moreover, no additional search burden is incurred by examination of both those claims.

With regard to group II, claim 26 has been recast to be dependent upon device claim 39. The dependency of claim 26 on claim 39 incorporates

the special technical features of claims 35 and 39 into claim 26. The further recitations of claim 26 constitute additional limitations to those special technical features. Claim 26 therefore shares the general inventive concept of claims 35 and 39. The unity of invention nature of claims 26 through 34 and 36 through 38 has already been acknowledged in the restriction/election requirement by grouping those claims into a common group.

With regard to group I, claim 18 has also been amended to be dependent upon claim 39, wherein the floor table of claim 18 table is structured and dimensioned for cooperation with the device of claim 39. The recitations of claim 18 are taken within the context of the previous recitations of claim 38, therefore casting an interdependence among the elements of those two claims which necessarily causes the special technical features of claim 39 to be incorporated in claim 18. The Examiner has already acknowledged the unity of claims 18 through 25 by grouping them together in the invention of group I.

For the reasons given above, the Applicant submits that claim set as amended now satisfies the requirements of 35 USC 121 and 372 as articulated by 37 CFR 1.499. Examination of all claims of record is therefore requested.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

12

Respectfully submitted

Paul Vincent

Dr. Paul Vincent

Reg. No. 37,461

June 8, 2009

Date

Kohler Schmid Moebus
Patentanwälte
Ruppmannstrasse 27
D-70565 Stuttgart
Germany
Telephone: 49-711-78 47 30
Fax : 49-711-78 00 996